

APPENDIX 10(C)

SETTLEMENT BY SETTLEMENT SITE SELECTION COMMENTARY

The sections below provide a brief overview of the site selection reasoning within each settlement with major allocations, concentrating on environmental factors. Full reasoning is available within the Committee reports cross-referenced with the main Revised Environmental Report and available via www.highland.gov.uk/whilp .

A LOCHABER

B SKYE & LOCHALSH

A LOCHABER

1 FORT WILLIAM

All of Fort William's potential development sites are constrained in environmental terms. These range from the flood risk associated with the river and lochside locations to the landscape sensitivity of the entrance to Glen Nevis. Also from the blanket bog habitat at Blar Mor to the swift population and built heritage constraints of town centre brownfield sites. Given this position where there is no clear best practicable environmental option or options, the Council has chosen to "cast the net wide" in terms of allocations. It will be for the public examination process to fully test the relative merits of the sites put forward. Developer requirements have been strengthened for all sites through the process to secure mitigation of potential effects and some boundaries have been amended to reduce or eliminate impact such as at the Cromwell Fort and Claggan/Achintee.

Torlundy rather than Fassfern is now supported as the optimum location for any new settlement although this too needs to be judged against allocated alternatives through the examination process. This preference was based upon it being closer to Fort William, its better active travel connections, its marginally better public transport accessibility, the potential to create a genuine new community with employment facilities closeby and the established nature of settlement in the area. The only significant suggested but rejected land was at the Smelter on the A82 northern approach to Fort William. This has not been supported because of its dependence on major un-programmed trunk road improvements and because it will lead to coalescence with Torlundy, which if confirmed, should function as a satellite new community.

2 SPEAN BRIDGE

The allocation of land opposite Little Chef will allow for a comprehensive housing, business and community development further enhancing the status of Spean Bridge as a local centre. The development will be phased and secure that no houses are located close to areas subject to flood risk whilst it will provide a futureproof supply of housing as well as business and community land. The site promotes sustainable travelling patterns by both being central and close to local amenities and by offering the closest option, served by bus, to commuters working in Fort William. The

redevelopment of the two depots will utilise two brownfield, central sites which will rationalise accesses onto A 82(T) whilst a safeguard was set on the land occupied by Little Chef in order to maintain the current use of the land in the future so it can provide employment generating developments, thus contributing to sustainable communities. Consent has already been granted for development at Blarour whilst the site in Burnbank will offer a sensitive business and housing development opposite the school which will contribute towards a pedestrian/cycle crossing over A86 and will protect the remaining ancient woodland. In addition, the development on Morrison Avenue will provide affordable housing adjacent to the village centre and will also expand the existing play area close by.

The suggested site in the old primary school was rejected because of concerns regarding the further ribboning of the settlement. The site and an existing consent on it embrace redevelopment of the existing buildings. However, any additional development would represent an unnecessary extension of the settlement contributing to increased use of car in a settlement that already has an efficient supply of centrally located land. A suggested site behind the Aonach Mor hotel was not allocated as it is not offered for increased density development and as such it is covered by the Settlement Development Area and other policies under the emerging local plan.

3 ROY BRIDGE

The allocations in Roy Bridge cater for its organic expansion by providing a range of sites to allow for different options to both developers and potential home owners. Land identified for housing and business off Bohenie road benefits from being within walking distance to amenities such as the school and the post office, encouraging thus sustainable travel patterns. Although there are flood risk issues regarding these sites, they are addressed by a requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. The site in Glen Roy can provide affordable housing at a central location. Developer requirements such as the high quality design and layout for the site address any adverse effects on the setting of the adjacent listed building identified in the site's SEA matrix. Moreover, land at Mulroy terrace is identified for a sensitive development which will not adversely affect the geological SSSI. The development of the site will be subject to the provision of an alternative play area. An additional business site is identified in Achaderry for which woodland retention and setback are required in order to mitigate local concerns.

Concerns over the retention of the core path and closeby woodland and other non SEA related reasons such as the decision of The Highland Council to keep the school open for the time being have led to the rejection of housing sites in Achaderry and at the primary school site respectively.

Finally, the refusal to allocate housing land at near 8 Braeroy road was due to the suitability of the site. It was decided that an extension to the SDA would be more appropriate to deal with the request as the site is unsuitable for a substantial development for other, non SEA related reasons. Any development on this land will be judged according to the policies of the local plan.

4 INVERGARRY

Consented land west of mill will provide 4 single house plots whilst the extended site adjoining the village hall will, if developed, provide most of Invergarry's housing supply. Its developer requirements will protect any remaining ancient woodland and site houses away from flood risk areas. Both sites will provide for housing within walking distance to community facilities whilst considering the geographical constraints of Invergarry, they form the settlement's natural extension. Housing and visitor accommodation is envisaged at Easter Mandally. The land can only be considered second best solution for Invergarry's expansion with constraints regarding access, candidate AGLV and ancient woodland. However, the landowner's willingness to develop the land in conjunction with MU2, together with a rigid set of developer requirements and the provision of business land resulted to both sites being allocated. Other business sites include the one adjoining the village hall for which a developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment was added to mitigate concerns and the forestry commission depot which although distant, it represents a brownfield opportunity and as such it merits allocation.

A suggested housing site has had to be rejected. The site is a greenfield distant from the centre of the settlement site and its development would lead to unsustainable travel patterns at a time where better alternatives exist. A crossover into ancient woodland would also provide to be a constraint.

5 GAIRLOCHY

The allocations in Gairloch have been chosen in order to provide for various small sites that will be able to sit comfortably within the existing settlement. Constraints such as the Caledonian Canal SAM, the SSSI and the AGLV cover the whole of Gairloch and that is why we have opted to embrace them in the settlement's objectives instead of in each site. A need to avoid allocating housing in the open area/flood plain between the Canal and Mucomir has resulted to the settlement being distinctly divided between two areas. Sites H1, H2, H4, and H5 have all tree related developer requirements in order to mitigate concerns. These safeguards, together with their location or landowner's willingness have contributed to them being allocated in order to provide an efficient supply of land for Gairloch. The site North of Mucomir is the only one proposed for a more dense development in accordance with the pattern to the south of it and always in respect to the SSSI. Opportunities for low density development are also offered south of the Caravan Park. The site benefits from being at the entrance of the settlement and thus it will not increase traffic within Mucomir for most of the service provision related travels. In addition, land west of the Caravan Site in Gairloch provides for a small, employment generating and probably marine related development subject to a number of safeguards regarding woodland and other important characteristics.

A suggestion for a mixed use site west of Caledonian Canal had to be rejected. This extensive field would face increased costs of development regarding to woodland and other relevant safeguards whilst it would impinge on the Canal SAM, affecting views over open water in a settlement that already has an effective supply of land.

6 MALLAIG

The allocation process in Mallaig was focused on redevelopment and exploitation of brownfield opportunities. Three Housing sites were identified to form the natural extension of the settlement. The sites, although constrained due to landform and other factors, have some development potential and might be capable to provide a distributor road in the future. Once again, mitigation of concerns relating to the AGLV was taken up in the objectives of the settlement in order to cover all potential development. Land for community use is identified between the High school and the Mackintosh centre for a school hostel, whilst employment opportunities are provided in both brownfield land for Harbour related activities and at Glasnacardoch's unused agricultural land at the settlement's entrance.

The allocation of business land west of A830(T) was rejected. The site, although it represents a brownfield opportunity, was contested by the relevant interests in a previous plan stage. However, the decision was taken to maintain the land within the Settlement Development Area in order to promote redevelopment in case the situation changes.

7 MORAR

The allocations in Morar reflect an attempt to consolidate the settlement both in geographical terms and by means of service provision. An effective housing site was identified in each cluster with recreation and community facilities being allocated within walking distance. An expansion of the site North of Achnaluin was decided in order to extend access options and avoid onerous costs of development. At the same time, adequate safeguards protecting footlinks and the existing natural and built environment were added to both developer requirements and the settlement's objectives as fit. An extension to the site in Beoraid (south) was rejected in order to avoid housing being built on exposed hills, especially at a time where there is an adequate provision of housing land. A mixed use development in envisaged east of the cemetery in order to provide recreation and community facilities in that part of Morar thus reducing car use within the settlement. An exceptional siting and design requirement will also address any concerns over impingement of views towards the loch.

The suggested relocation of the mixed use site was rejected as the site would face increasing costs of development while there are better alternatives within the settlement and due to the lack of community facilities within walking distance on the west side of Morar.

8 ARISAIG

Allocations in Arisaig were focused on promoting a car free movement of people within the settlement and at the same time to retain the green areas in the centre. The AGLV that covers the whole of the village was decided to be protected by an objective. Both the housing sites within the village will provide improved pedestrian/cycle route/crossing to the village centre. Land for a primary school and recreation area is safeguarded at the centre of the settlement which will encourage walking in the future. Land for employment generating activities is identified as part of a mixed use brownfield redevelopment of the harbour. A masterplan is required to address concerns over flood risk, phasing and sensitivity to the environment. Another business site is identified in the Mains which will require a flood risk assessment.

9 LOCHAILORT

At the time of drawing the deposit draft of the plan there is a shellfish water designation considered for Loch Ailort. Also, the Appropriate Assessment regarding the Sound of Arisaig SAC will bring to the surface appropriate mitigation for any development in Lochailort. The allocations in the settlement are focused on central sites that will improve and rationalise existing accesses whilst the objective for high quality siting and design will protect the AGLV from any inappropriate development. An employment opportunity is identified on brownfield land nearby the fish farm where it will share access costs with adjacent housing sites. In addition, the proximity of housing and business land will promote more sustainable travel patterns within the settlement.

10 ACHNAPHUBUIL

There is one small infill housing allocation identified in Achnaphubuil. This site was carried forward but a representation highlighted an additional developer requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment because it is adjacent land of medium to high flood risk.

11 ACHARACLE

The allocations in Acharacle consolidate the existing form and maintain the grain and encourage reuse of a brownfield site whilst making best use of infrastructure. The large mixed use allocation MU1 was split up to ensure a specific business allocation with road frontage adjacent existing businesses. The other mixed use allocation is a partially brownfield site but required changes to the developer requirements on the back of the revised SEA to ensure compliance with SPP7. H1 required additional mitigation in terms of pedestrian connection. However H2 at Mingarry was deleted because of the inappropriate level of development but retained within the SDA with an additional requirement to secure acceptable foul drainage provision. H3 required revision to its SEA and additional developer requirements in the Local Plan for junction improvements, pedestrian connections to the village, and to retain woodland important to the setting/amenity.

An extension to the H3 allocation was included because of its suitability in terms of SEA however a flood risk assessment is added as a developer requirement.

12 ARGDOUR/CLOVULLIN/CORRAN

The allocations spread the potential over several sites maintaining the overall grain adjacent to existing services/infrastructure carefully respecting the landscape capacity. The previous community allocation was changed to mixed use because a branch surgery is now unlikely. It represents a good infill site but because it lies within the designed landscape of Ardgour House exceptional siting and design are required so this was added as a requirement. The same applies for H2, B2 and H3. B2 was also extended because its SEA's indicated this is suitable and it serves to provide a better balance of uses. However H3 was reduced to protect locally important croft land. Land previously allocated for housing east of the school was also removed because of the difficulty of developing it sensitively within the landform.

It was considered that this site was less appropriate than the others which benefited from trees providing a backdrop and/or could be comfortably contained within the landform. Flood risk assessments for B1 and H5 were considered necessary and so were added in mitigation.

Despite a representation to increase the H1 allocation it was considered better to distribute the potential more evenly and not rely on the effectiveness of a site which would have fairly major initial infrastructure costs to overcome. Access improvements are still necessary at H1 so a requirement was added.

13 BALLACHULISH SOUTH

The small allocations identified will consolidate the settlement whilst important public open space and amenity is preserved. It is important that the openness between settlements is retained within the settled lochs landscape character so consolidating existing settlements is important. This does leave limited potential but a suggested housing/tourism allocation north and west of the hotel was resisted on grounds of the SEA which highlighted issues which could not be sufficiently mitigated. Mitigation of impact on listed boat sheds, on the landscape character, and the SAM fort, means that no part of the suggested allocation can be developed without resulting in unacceptable impacts on one of the aforementioned sensitivities. Some additional mitigation in terms of enhanced car parking and access are now mentioned for the mixed use allocation.

14 DUROR

The allocations identified serve to consolidate within the village envelope whilst retaining some open space and important croft land. The H1 allocation was split up and a long term allocation was created to ensure appropriate phasing of development. A hook for developer contributions to cover the reconfiguration of the junction was added. Requirements for pedestrian connections and open space came on the back of representations and a subsequent revision to the SEA. H2 was amended to exclude good croft land and this removed the need for FRA on the remaining site. H3 was continued but became a mixed use allocation because of its central location and the need to balance the substantial housing allocations identified.

An enlargement to H3 was rejected on landscape capacity grounds, taking development beyond the village envelope and onto higher ground. A proposed long term tourism allocation to the north of the hotel was rejected because of its unacceptable impact on the cycleway without any obvious acceptable mitigation. Land at the old mill was put forward for housing which being adjacent to medium to high flood risk would require an FRA however advice from our roads colleagues stymied its inclusion within the SDA.

15 GLENACHULISH

The allocations in Glenachulish will need to meet SEPA requirements for waste water treatment. They do represent a logical extension of the settlement and can be suitably mitigated in terms of their impact on the landscape. Their scale necessitates a comprehensive approach for land assembly infrastructure and services. On the strength of the public's and SNH's concerns the plan was revised to ensure a

masterplan exercise is carried out for MU1, MU2 and MU3. This will address concerns regarding landscape/visual impact and phasing of development and help engage the public.

A proposed extension of MU3 further north was rejected because of the prominence of the site in landscape impact terms and the affect it would have on general amenity removing ancient long established woodland.

16 GLENBORRODALE

The allocation in Glenborrodale remains the same but other opportunities existing for small scale development within the SDA. There is sensitivity in terms of the setting of the SAC. However the added objective ensures the integrity of the SAC is further highlighted as an issue even though it already had protection through the reference to policy 4. Also the associated structures and the designed landscape of Glenborrodale House are considerations highlighted and identified in the objectives.

17 GLENCOE

The form of Glencoe will be strengthened by the allocations identified which will consolidate the settlement. However H1, H2 and B2 were amended to reflect advice from SEPA regarding the requirement for FRA and also contributions are now required towards any consequential coastal flood prevention works necessary. Both H4 and C1 were removed to reflect the owner's interests. However there is still adequate land identified.

A proposal to extend the SDA west of H5 was rejected due to the impact on trees and amenity and because of the access. A mixed use allocation has been supported at Glencoe ski centre for business and tourism uses with mitigation in terms of parking, access and landscaping improvements with exceptional design and siting required.

18 INCHREE

The allocations fit comfortably within the landscape, limit intrusion on the woodland and will help consolidate the village. However after considering the representations and the SEA for the allocations some revision to the allocations and requirements was necessary. The allocations C1 and B1 were removed because of the flood risk. However in order to maintain a balance to the allocations the H1 allocation is changed to mixed use with provision of community and business land. Also the site was reduced with the balance reallocated for long term to ensure appropriate phasing of development. The H2 allocation is also amended to minimise the impact on the SAC with a requirement to wherever possible reinstate and enhance the habitat value. A masterplan approach for both allocations is necessary because of the scale of development and to have proper regard of the impact on the SAC. This is therefore now a requirement. This will also help communicate the proposals effectively and engage the community on the detailed proposals.

19 KENTALLEN

There was a change to the SDA to reflect an extant planning consent but otherwise the Local Plan content here remains unchanged leaving small scale opportunities that can be exploited but only with consideration of the natural and cultural heritage features.

20 KILCHOAN

The allocations in Kilchoan follow naturally from the existing pattern of development and will maintain the grain, form and shape and retain seaward views. The representation made regarding the SAM forts setting in terms of MU2 by Historic Scotland lead to its subsequent removal because these negative impacts could not be sufficiently mitigated through developer requirements. A new allocation south of the pier B1 has been identified for pier related uses along with a separate business allocation between H3 and the coast guard building. These replace the MU2 allocation and fit well with the linear pattern of development. B1 is also a sensitive site and it is difficult to assess and mitigate the impact of B1 prior to proposals being developed. Therefore pre application discussions with SNH and Historic Scotland are required and the proximity to the SAM and sensitivity of the geological interest here within the SSSI are highlighted.

21 KINLOCHLEVEN

Kinlochleven's attractive setting and its public open space adjacent the River Leven are protected. These attributes are particularly important to maintain within the National Scenic Area. The allocations avoid encouraging development onto the rising land and they also respect the industrial heritage of Kinlochleven. No major revisions were necessary just some additional mitigation. The capacity of H2 was reduced to retain some open space as was H3's capacity in order to retain sufficient public parking. On H4 open space was made a developer requirement along with safeguarding/enhancing pedestrian connections. For MU1 protection of the scheduled structures and their setting, and FRA were added as additional requirements.

22 LOCHALINE

The importance of protecting the setting of Keil church is recognised along with the need to control piecemeal development on the edge of the settlement. Allocations are concentrated to the west of the A884 respecting the shape and form of the village. H2 was removed because of the negative impact this level of development would have on amenity and setting. B2 was removed because of the impact on public views and in response to concerns regarding the recently restored soldiers well.

New sites were identified for consideration and gained support with additional business allocations identified at old kiel camp, and north east of the war memorial. The former is a secluded sheltered site which is therefore not visually prominent. Although the later removes an area previously shown as open space it does not remove usable open space as the area with pathways and amenity remains protected. Development can also be accommodated sympathetically within the landform.

23 NORTH BALLACHULISH

The rising woodland, the A82, and the margins of the loch define the physical limits of development. The SDA and allocations have been identified within the lower lying land but also make sure to respect the settlement form and avoid the better croft land. Planning permission has been granted and the build is underway on the H2 site at Loch Leven hotel. In order to ensure high development standards including a respect for the existing form and grain, open space has been added as a developer requirement for H1. This along with a reduction in its capacity and requirements for a masterplan and woodland retention/enhancement will help secure sensitive development here. Elsewhere the protection of archaeological features is secured through setbacks for allocations and the SDA and through requirement for hydrological reports on areas of peat bog.

24 ONICH

Options are limited by the need to maintain seaward views and the open character. There is also a need to avoid losing good croft land and developing on the rising land which also serves to protect the SAC. The only allocation is on a small gap site on a former garage allocation. This provides opportunity whilst avoiding encroachment into the SAC. An extra developer requirement has been added for a FRA.

25 SALEN

The large housing allocation has been removed with potential instead to support the use of Forestry Commission holdings to help meet affordable housing requirements within a revised smaller SDA. This will better protect the amenity and woodland setting of Salen and encourage proposals which reflect the existing grain and are of a more suitable scale considering the lack of public sewerage provision. A mixed use allocation has been identified at the jetty but onshore sewerage facilities will be required if a marina is proposed.

26 STRONTIAN

The allocations identified avoid the rising land, do not encroach upon the village's woodland setting, and help to consolidate within the envelope of the village. The H3 allocation was removed on the back of representations made regarding its recreational and amenity value. Also the mixed use allocation of the former hotel is now reserved for business uses and a flood risk requirement has been added. An extension to the SDA was supported at Drimnatorran, however further development here is dependent on access improvements.

B SKYE & LOCHALSH

1 ACHMORE

Achmore is relatively well placed in having few heritage or water environment constraints. Site selection has therefore centred upon allocating land as close as possible to the centre of this nucleated village. Riverside land has not been allocated to avoid flood risk, protect existing vegetation and to safeguard land for enhanced public sewerage provision. In compensation, land to the north of the village has been expanded because it suffers from fewer constraints and has better ground conditions.

2 AUCHTERTYRE

Auchtertyre was highlighted as a growth centre for the Lochalsh area because of constraints at Kyle and because of its centrality, spare primary school capacity, road network accessibility and availability of relatively serviceable land. Over the course of the Plan process various sites have been suggested by local landowners and those confirmed are the sites that offer the best balance of planning factors. Trunk road access and the scale of growth have been the determining factors rather than environmental issues although surface water flood risk has led to the deferral of land north of the village. Scale is also related to spare sewerage capacity and this led to the rejection of the resort proposal south west of the village which could have had a potentially harmful effect in terms of discharges to the three lochs SAC. Landscape considerations led to the rejection of other suggested sites outwith the village.

3 BALMACARA

There are only two confirmed allocations at Balmacara. One has a partial planning consent for housing development and is partly brownfield. The other, the former caravan and camping park, is now safeguarded for community / recreational use. This should ensure that the tree / woodland resource is managed. Potential flood risk set-back is also flagged for the site.

4 DORNIE

Dornie's allocations have not varied to any great degree through the Plan process, concentrating on land at Carr Brae and Graham House. One site is brownfield and the other benefits from a long standing allocation. Developer requirements have been fine tuned to ensure adequate mitigation in particular in terms of adequate sewerage provision. Allocations on croftland to the north of the village centre have been rejected for settlement pattern, access and loss of croftland reasons.

5 GLENELG

Glenelg's allocation history has been complex. Many sites have been suggested, amended, rejected or added throughout the Plan process to date. This has been caused by an active community, the changing attitude of landowners and recognition of environmental constraints. Archaeological interests led to the removal of the Glebe land east of the village but the opportunity to have positive mitigation in terms of interpretation of the Barracks has led to a new allocation. Flood risk issues have led

to augmented developer requirements or a reduction in site boundaries. New brownfield sites have been included at the south end of the village in preference to site options to build on better croft land. A new bird hide allocation has been included to again offer positive environmental action. The central housing sites have been re-affirmed and will be required to connect to the enhanced sewerage facilities in the village.

6 INVERINATE

Only one allocation has been retained at Inverinate and this has been reduced in size and capacity to take account of bat species and habitat interests. The other site east of the primary school was removed because of availability and access concerns but also because of woodland and built heritage proximity issues.

7 KYLE OF LOCHALSH

The vast majority of Kyle's initial suggested allocations have been retained. Environmental considerations have been addressed through strengthened developer requirement mitigation. The West of Clan Garage site has been deleted as a positive allocation to reflect fears about landscape impact, contamination and ground stability. The suggested but rejected site was on exposed and prominent land east of the village.

8 PLOCKTON

Plockton's potential development sites are very restricted by environmental constraints notably built heritage. Consequently few allocations have been confirmed and they have augmented developer requirement mitigation. More radical suggestions to open up croftland to the north and west of the settlement have been discounted or deferred because of crofting, ownership, landscape, feasibility and access concerns. Land at Burnside now has a planning consent and is arguably the least constrained site in environmental terms given that it is distant from the principal heritage features but can be connected to community facilities. The examination process will need to clarify whether infill opportunities should be retained.

9 RATAGAN

Ratagan only retains a single allocation, which now has augmented developer requirement mitigation. More extensive site options were not confirmed because of scale and woodland loss / set-back issues.

10 RERAIG

Allocations for housing, affordable housing, a shinty pitch and community allotments have been re-affirmed. The land has few environmental constraints and the Council believes any effects can be addressed by the required developer mitigation.

11 SOUTH STROME

Only one site allocation remains at South Strome due to the constraints imposed by woodland, slope stability, aspect and access. It comprises the brownfield Marconi Yard and even this site is subject to considerable developer requirement mitigation to cover issues such as flood risk, contamination and landscape impact.

12 ARMADALE

Most site options at Armadale have been re-affirmed as allocations. Environmental concerns have been addressed via augmented developer requirement mitigation. The exceptions have related to flood risk where some sites have been reduced or deleted to take account of this issue. Land at Rubha Phoil has been rejected because of potential adverse landscape impact on such a prominent headland.

13 BROADFORD

Many of Broadford's site options have been re-affirmed through the SEA and Plan processes. This befits the relatively low environmental sensitivity of many allocations and the role of Broadford as a principal settlement. However, amendments have been made to reflect environmental considerations notably at the airstrip to recognise the need for further assessment and to exclude the SSSI boundary. Flood risk has led to the deletion of the Riverbank site. Elsewhere protected species survey and tree management concerns have been picked up in augmented developer requirement mitigation. The overall philosophy has been to consolidate the core of the community to encourage active travel to community and commercial facilities. For this reason, more peripheral sites such as Cnoc na Cachaille have been rejected as expansion areas.

14 CAMASCROSS

The allocation process at Camascross has been driven largely by the changing attitudes of landowners and crofting interests. All potential allocations are sensitive in landscape terms and exceptional siting and design quality mitigation has been a consistent requirement. Access constraints and lack of mains drainage have led to the only confirmed allocation being alongside the A851.

15 CARBOST

Carbost's initial development site options have been scaled back to those closest to the village centre in order to promote better active travel sustainability and to minimise the loss of good grazing land. The one exception is the part brownfield site at the Glenbrittle junction which is proposed for redevelopment subject to exceptional siting and design including minimised re-contouring and planting.

16 DUNVEGAN

The net was cast very wide for Dunvegan at the site options stage. However, the SEA and Plan processes have reduced the number of now confirmed sites. These have been de-allocated principally because of croft land issues but also because of

lack of active travel connectivity and built heritage constraints. Those sites that are retained have augmented developer requirement mitigation to address issues such as bat habitat loss at the Castle car park, built heritage impact close to St Mary's Church and better referencing of the Loch Dunvegan SAC.

17 EDINBANE

The SEA process has led to a sharp reduction in the confirmed development sites within Edinbane compared to the site options stage. Woodland to the rear of Gesto hospital has been safeguarded by de-allocation. Important croft land landscape character has been protected by the deletion of an affordable housing site north of the former post office. Expansion land at Coishletter has been deferred until the next Plan period. Retained sites' developer requirement mitigation has also been strengthened. Housing is now to be directed to lower Coishletter where it has good landscape fit and is close to the village centre. Elsewhere the emphasis will be on dispersed croft house development.

18 FERRINDONALD / TEANGUE

Few allocations have been confirmed through the Plan process. Landscape impact and slope stability were key factors in the decision not to proceed with site options north west of Knock Farm. However, these options and others that were removed were also taken out because of loss of croft / agricultural land concerns and access. The sites that survive have augmented developer requirement mitigation.

19 KILBEG

Kilbeg has emerged as the Council's preferred site for a new community to serve Sleat. Several options were considered but discounted. Forestry plantation locations at Broadford, Tormore, Kinloch and on the Ord Road have all been suggested. Broadford's forestry area is part allocated but is too distant from Sleat's indigenous development needs to offer a practicable solution. Sleat's other plantations are similarly divorced from Sleat's population and employment centres and therefore do not offer a sustainable solution. Accordingly, Kilbeg was chosen for a significant expansion in the earlier Plan drafts. A change in landowner attitude has meant that land availability should no longer be a constraint at this location and therefore a more extensive new community allocation has been made to compensate for the reduction in sites elsewhere and to create a critical mass of development to support required mitigation such as structural landscaping and enhanced water and sewerage provision. The presence of existing and planned future community, employment and infrastructure facilities closeby lends support to the sustainability of the location and proposal.

20 KYLEAKIN

Most of the village's allocations have been retained and the Altanavaig Quarry site has been increased to reflect the area with planning consent but with a possible environmental assessment requirement. Elsewhere there have been changes of use to reflect changing priorities but a focus on brownfield or other degraded development sites. Each retained site has been given enhanced developer

requirement mitigation to address issues such as flood risk. The site south of An t-Ob has been deleted due to access and woodland impact concerns.

21 PORTREE

The site selection philosophy for Portree initially followed that outlined in the Adopted Skye and Lochalsh Local Plan 1999. However, given the fast progression of the Home Farm expansion area and the likely unavailability of previously allocated land at Shullishader it became clear that additional development land would be required. Accordingly, land at Achachork, Kiltaraglen and on the Struan Road all fell to be considered as potential development sites. All have environmental constraints particularly in terms of breaching the natural river valley corridor landscape context of Portree but remain the next best options after Home Farm. Suitably stringent developer requirements have been added for these sites to ensure appropriate mitigation in landscape and active travel / public transport connectivity terms.

Similarly other retained sites such as those at Bayfield have strengthened mitigation to protect key public views, to secure adequate waste disposal and to ensure any harbour re-development is subject to environmental assessment. Cherished public open spaces within the village have been specifically safeguarded from development.

22 INVERARISH (RAASAY)

Many environmental constraints limit development options at Inverarish. The initial approach was to exclude site options at Raasay House because of the sensitivity of this location. Brownfield options or sites with an existing landscape context were considered next and this led to the inclusion and subsequent retention of the former sawmill, the Home Farm, the Henderson Bridge site and land Forestry Commission land north of School Park. Other land at School Park has also been retained because of its focus for community facilities. Outstanding environmental effects have been addressed via augmented developer requirement mitigation.

23 STAFFIN

Staffin's key constraint is its crofting landscape character and quality. This led to the reduction in site capacities and boundaries and the deletion of one site option - north of the Columba Centre. However, the majority of the sites are retained but with enhanced developer requirement mitigation plus better Plan-wide references to better siting and design and its importance to crofting landscape character.

24 UIG

Only two allocations have survived the SEA and Plan process to date. Both are brownfield and should therefore have limited environmental impact indeed there may be a net benefit. Loss of croft land has been the principal reason for the de-allocation of other sites notably land west of the pier and land east of the hall. That said, the loss of corncrake habitat at Idrigill and proximity to the scheduled ancient monument at North Cuil were contributory factors.